No. 30

No. 3.

"PROSCRIPTION IS ITSELF TO BE PROSCRIBED."

(Senator Preston.)

Before the last Presidential election the country was full of promises by the Whigs, not to make removals from office for difference of opinion. Since that party became seated in power, the country has been equally full of harsh and wanton violations of those promises.

The Democrats had long been denounced by their opponents as Robespierres, reeking with the blood of slaughtered victims, and acting on what was denounced as an unrighteous maxim, that to the *victors belong the spoils.* But since the 4th of March, 1841, from the moment the Whig President was sworn into office, and even before he had reached the palace in his triumphal procession through Pennsylvania avenue, the work of proscription began in the Senate, by a proposition there made, and afterwards adopted, to remove the public printers. The guillotine has seldom stopped since, as hundreds, and even thousands of heads have been struck off without accusation, except devotion to those democratic principles imbibed from Hancock, Jefferson, and a host of our revolutionary sires; and the spoils of every office, from a tide-waiter to a prime minister, have been seized on by the Whigs, with a voracity totally unexampled in the annals of the Republic.

Neither patriotism and wounds in war; nor virtues in private life; nor arduous services in council and legislation; neither urgent necessities, nor honest dependency, have been any protection from this ruthless proscription; but an indiscriminate warfare has been waged upon every incumbent, however blameless, when his place was needed by a hungry partisan of power, and where his conscientious convictions of duty had prevented him from joining in the orgies of the Whig canvass of 1840.

It is not our purpose on this occasion to discuss the propriety or impropriety of removals from office on such principles. But we hold it due to the purity of public morals, and the safety of republican principles, to hang up for public reprobation and indignant scorn, not merely the inconsistencies, but the hypocrisy and perfidy which have been practised by the Whig leaders on this absorbing subject.

One of the Senators from New Hampshire, (Mr. Peirce,) in an eloquent speech delivered in the Senate, July 2d, 1841, said:

"That removals have occurred, is not the thing of which I complain. I complain of your hypocrisy. I charge that your press and your leading orators made promises to the nation which they did not intend to redeem, and which they now vainly attempt to cover up by cobwebs. The Senator from South Carolina near me (Mr. Calhoun) remarked yesterday, that he had no language to express the *infamy* which, in his judgment, must attach to that man who had been before the people raising his voice in the general shout that proscription was to be proscribed, and was, in the face of such action, now here begging for place at the footstool of power."

Let us then examine, a moment, the proof of the pledges, which were made on this subject. And next the evidence, so wide and decisive, of the ruthlessness with which every promise of forbearance has been prophaned.

The first statement which I shall cite is from General Harrison himself. At Cleaveland, Ohio, he said:

"I see over the way a public officer; although he may oppose me, if he does so honestly and conscientiously, I shall be the last man to disturb him. Before I would remove him for a mere difference of opinion, *I would suffer my right arm to be severed from my body.*"

Again see an extract from his letter to the Hon. J. M. Berrien:

Blair & Rives, printers.....1844.

"I am opposed to the practice of making appointments to office the reward of partisan services."

Yet, urged by party importunities around him, in the face of this, and without the slightest offence beyond "*a mere difference of opinion,*" he proceeded, as we shall soon ascertain from official documents, to remove numerous Democrats, and reward with their places the "*partisan services*" of numerous Whigs. Passing over several other similar pledges made by him, I next quote one or two, made by his successor.

In a debate in the Senate in 1334, Mr. Tyler remarked, on the Executive power of removal, as follows:

"*But if used merely to reward favorites and to punish opponents—if the offices of the Government shall be considered as* 'SPOILS,' *to be distributed among a victorious party,*—then indeed, sir, *the consequences are most fatal;* all stability in Government is at an end; *novices* are introduced in the place of long-tried, experienced, and faithful public agents; *and the public interests suffer, and suffer severely.* * * * * * * *" "The Presidential power is thereby swollen *beyond all just bounds;* operating perpetually on the hopes and fears of men, *his will becomes law.* Nor would there be a secure refuge in the courts of justice. True, he cannot evict the judge; *but, by his power over the marshal,* HE COULD PACK THE JURY."

Notwithstanding these honeyed professions, we shall soon find how skilfully it has been attempted to exercise "*a power over the marshal,*" in more than half the States of the Union, by removal from office; and that done, we well know, in most cases, not for any malfeasance; but whether to *pack the jury,* or "*merely to reward favorites and to punish opponents,*" those engaged in the removals know best.

Let us next put to the bar of the public that distinguished Secretary of State, who was the bosom and constitutional adviser, of both the late President and Vice President, on these agitating matters.

In a debate in the Senate, in 1835, he (Mr. Webster) declared:

"After considering the question of removal from office by the President again and again, within the last six years, in my deliberate judgment the original decision was wrong. I cannot but think that those who denied the power in 1789 had the best of the argument."

"It appears to me after thorough and repeated, and conscientious examination, that an *erroneous interpretation* was given to the Constitution in this respect, by the decision of the first Congress."

He repeated, in substance, the same opinions in 1840, *under an October sun* at Richmond. On this the Hon. Mr. McRoberts says, in the Senate:

"Then, from February, 1835, until October, 1840, according to Mr. Webster, (and he is the great oracle of his party upon constitutional law,) there was no power in the Constitution to authorize the President alone to remove from office. Has the Constitution of the United States been altered or changed since that time? How is it that this denounced, repudiated, and rejected power—the power of removal from office—should have sprung into newness of life, as by a resurrection from the dead, on the 4th of March, 1841?

"Sir, with all these arguments and solemn declarations of the now Secretary of State, against the constitutional power of the President to remove from office, he now heads an Administration that has been, since the 4th of March, proscribing men, and removing from office, on the ground of political opinion, in a manner and with an audacity and recklessness never witnessed in any civilized country."

Next read the declarations of Mr. Ewing, the Secretary of the Treasury, under General Harrison. He had, in 1832, offered, in the Senate resolutions denying the constitutional power to make those very removals, which, generally, for no cause but political differences of opinion, he afterwards helped so remorsely to exercise in respect to custom-house officers over the whole Union. These were his words:

"*Resolved,* That the practice of removing officers by the President for any other purpose than that of securing a faithful execution of the laws, is hostile to the spirit of the Constitution, was never contemplated by its framers, is an extension of executive influence, is prejudicial to the public service, and dangerous to the liberties of the people.

"*Resolved,* That it is inexpedient for the Senate to advise and consent to the appointment of any person to fill a supposed vacancy in any office, occasioned by the removal of a prior incumbent, unless such prior incumbent shall appear to have been removed for sufficient cause."

Mr. Bell, the Secretary of War to General Harrison, had made like professions, only to be violated in his department as well as others; and one of them dated while the President lay on his death-bed. [See it stated in Doc. No. 58, Ho. of Reps., Jan. 1842, page 78.]

In the debates in April, 1840, in the House of Representatives, his remarks will be found.

Mr. Clay again and again held the same doctrine.

On the 10th of March, 1834, he offered the following, among other resolutions:

"*Resolved*, That the Constitution of the United States does not vest in the President power to remove at his pleasure officers under the Government of the United States, whose offices have been established by law."

Last, but not least, having quoted enough on this topic, said before the election, came the noted declaration of Senator Preston, made after the election, but before the new Administration commenced its persecuting career:

"This system of proscription is itself to be proscribed. I stand on that ground; *and so help me God, I will, so far as I am concerned, act upon it.* I believe those who are to be at the head of the Government have put themselves upon the same ground. *They come into power, not to divide the spoils of the country among the members of a faction.* When that principle is avowed and followed, we cease from that moment to be a Government and a people; we pass into a conquered nation and a conquering faction, that seizes the power and the forms of government only for the gratification of cupidity and revenge."

"I protest against it; it is not Whig doctrine; the Administration coming into power reject and repudiate the infamous maxim, that to the victors belong the spoils. The spoils! What spoils? The spoils of our common country! The spoils of our brethren and fellow-citizens! Is the country a vanquished country? God forbid. I should as soon think of making spoil out of the possessions of my own family.

"*I shall resist and denounce all giving of office as a political reward, or turning out of office for mere political opinion.*"

Now look at the other picture—hideous as it may be—showing what has been the impotent performance of these specious promises.

Attempts have recently been made to mislead the public into a belief that few or no removals took place under General Harrison himself; and, at all events, that most of them occurred after the first Whig cabinet retired from power. But a painful sense of duty compels us to invite special attention to numerous removals before the death of General Harrison, as well as since, though often, doubtless, against his own better judgment and wishes; and to still more numerous ones before the quarrel of the Whig leaders with Mr. Tyler in August, 1841.

The first instance in which that party indicated how proscription was to be proscribed by them, occurred the very day on which commenced their ill-gotten power. With revolutionary speed, on the 4th of March, they introduced into the Senate a resolution, before referred to, to remove the public printers. It was in these summary words—

"Mr. Mangum submitted the following motion for consideration: *Resolved*, That Blair and Rives be dismissed as printers of the Senate for the 27th Congress."—[See Journal, p. 265.]

Without notice or trial, the work was speedily consummated. No malfeasance nor incapacity was pretended as a justification, but most of the country have looked on it as a shameless political-partisan removal, in order "to *punish opponents*, and, by the appointment of Whig successors, "*to reward favorites.*"

The next blow was struck the ensuing day, at the chief clerk in the State Department; and such was the indecent haste to remove him, that his dismissal was ordered, to give the spoils to the Secretary's own son, before the Secretary himself had been sworn into office, or was qualified by law to perform any official act whatever. The humiliating spectacle was thus presented, of the great Whig, styled "defender of the Constitution" and the laws, commencing his new career by a violation of both; and of his being compelled to retrace his steps, and retain the Democratic clerk till his own authority became legalized.

These rash beginnings were, in the next thirty days of the brief power of the first Whig President, followed by removals on removals, most of which must have received his own signature and sanction, as they were removals of heads of bureaus, of collectors, and land officers, of marshals and district attorneys, all of which classes of officers cannot be appointed or removed without the action of the President himself. And in due time these were succeeded by a host of other removals, such as postmasters, clerks, subordinate custom-house officers, light-house keepers, and persons in every grade of civil employment, till the heart sickens at the recital. The list below is extracted from official documents, sent to Congress, and compiled by Whig Secretaries.—[See the messages and reports in documents No. 48 and its supplement, House of Representatives, August 7th and 30th, 1841.]

I detail the most important removals, going before the Senate for approval, which bear date previous to General Harrison's death. Those not coming before the Senate, though much the greatest in number, as will soon be seen, are not specified, because not generally enumerated in the documents referred to, nor are any here specified, which happened after the President's funeral. I have added the names, as well as the dates, of the principal officers removed during the first month, in order that the public, who know full well the excellent characters of many of them, can see that nothing but partisan intolerance could have led to the hasty and violent proscription of most of the number.

Let it be recollected, also, before looking at the dates in the list, that the Senate were holding a special session from the 4th to the 15th of March inclusive. Now, if other causes than a mere difference in opinion led to these removals, they ought to have been made forthwith and submitted to the Senate for their confirmation. But it will be seen, that not one victim in this class of cases was attempted to be offered up till after their adjournment, which furnishes strong presumption that no other causes existed, and that the delay took place in order to avoid immediate discussion and exposure in the Senate, of the gross breaches of faith in making removals merely to punish opponents and reward partisans.

It will be seen in the list, that this part of the drama opened the very day after the Senate quit, by removing Mr. Flagg, the able Postmaster at Albany; this was followed by another that day, by five more the next, thirteen others the next, and so onward, till the melancholy arrest of the President in this career, by a fatal malady. Read the whole.

Schedule of removals during General Harrison's life, in offices so high as to come before the Senate for confirmation; but without causes assigned for the removal, either to the Senate or the public.

1. Az. C. Flagg, Postmaster, Albany, - - - 16th March.
2. Marks Crume, Receiver, Crawfordville, (Ind.,) - 16th March.
3. Mathew Birchard, Solicitor of the Treasury, from Ohio, 17th March.
4. C. K. Gardiner, Auditor Post Office Department, - 17th March.
5. Stephen Allen, Receiver General, at New York, - 17th March.
6. Ab. B. Fannin, Collector, Savannah, - - - 17th March.
7. James S. McGinniss, Register, Chilicothe, - - 17th March.
8. Isaac Hill, Receiver General, at Boston, - - 18th March.
9. J. R. Livingston, Navy Agent, New York, - - 18th March.
10. S. S. Rawson, Collector, Passamaquoddy, - - 18th March.
11. Ed. S. Jarvis, do. Frenchman's Bay, - 18th March.
12. R. H. Bridgham, do. Penobscot, - - - 18th March.
13. William Brown, do. Machias, - - - 18th March.
14. Nathl. M. Lowney, do. Belfast, - - - 18th March.
15. J. J. Morgan, do. New York, - - - 18th March.
16. William S. Coe, Naval Officer, New York, - - 18th March.

17. Ezekiel Foster, Surveyor, Eastport, - - - 18th March.
18. Stephen W. Eaton, do. Portland, - - - 18th March.
19. Eli Moore, do. New York, - - 18th March.
20. James R. Thompson, do. Town Creek, (Md.,) - 18th March.
21. Hudson M. Garland, Recorder, Land Office, - 19th March.
22. J. J. Singleton, Superintendent of the Mint, Georgia, 19th March.
23. Robt. R. Reid, Governor of Florida, - - - 19th March.
24. Denny McCobb, Collector, Waldoborough, - - 19th March.
25. Jon. P. Jenkins, do. York, - - - 19th March.
26. Jos. Sewall, do. Bath, - - - 19th March.
27. Isaac O. Barnes, Naval Officer, Boston, - - 19th March.
28. Archibald W. Hyde, Collector, Vermont, - - 20th March.
29. James W. Roach, do. St. Mary's, - - 22d March
30. John F. Rocker, do. St. Mark's, (Flo.,) 22d March
31. Henry Whitely, do. Delaware, - - 22d March.
32. John Dement, Receiver, Dixon, (Ill.,) - - - 22d March.
33. Godfrey J. Grosvenor, Postmaster, Geneva, - - 23d March.
34. James Page, do. Philadelphia, - 23d March.
35. L. S. Bear, Receiver, Green Bay, (Wis.,) 23d March.
36. F. Van Antwerp, do. Burlington, (Io.,) 24th March.
37. Rob. Lucas, Governor of Iowa, - - - - 25th March.
38. James Clark, Secretary of Iowa, . - - - 25th March.
39. William Frick, Collector, Baltimore, - - - 25th March.
40. Francis Gehon, Marshal of Iowa, - - - 25th March.
41. Wm. H. Ward, Solicitor of Land Office, - - 26th March.
42. Gideon Wells, Postmaster, Hartford, - - - 26th March.
43. Jos. Johnson, Treasurer of the Mint, Charleston, - 27th March.
44. J. P. Grundy, District Attorney, Tennessee, - - 27th March.
45. Wm. C. Scott, do. do. Arkansas, - 27th March.
46. Robt. R. Carr, Postmaster, Newport, - - - 27th March.
47. George Brent, Collector, Alexandria, (D. C.,) - 27th March.
48. Samuel Hackleton, Register, Dixon, (Ill.,) - - 27th March.
49. Pascal Bequette, Receiver, Muscoday, (Wis.,) - 27th March.

On this, or the next day, General Harrison was seized with an illness, from which he never recovered. But, while on his death-bed, the following removals were made.

50. Albert Leister, Postmaster, Canandaigua, New York, 31st of March.

(*a*) 51. Wm. J. Findlay, Treasurer of the Mint, 2d of April.

On the 4th of April, General Harrison died, and was buried on the 7th. While he reposed in his coffin, but unburied, the following removal appears:

James N. Barker, Comptroller, 6th of April, 1841.

Thus far speak the official reports, as to the removals made under General Harrison, in his brief month of power, in those important cases, which afterwards came before the Senate for confirmation. But the vast mass of removals were of a character not required to be confirmed by the Senate. Computing these last, during that month, at only one-sixth of the number hereafter estimated to have been removed in the first six months of Whig power, and they will equal five hundred. This would make the whole average about forty removals per day from the adjournment of the Senate to the commencement of the President's fatal sickness.

This is a most lamentable illustration, and chiefly from the official records of his own cabinet, as to the manner in which *proscription was proscribed* under the

(*a*) *Note.*—See another case of removal not sent to the Senate, in document No. 58, to House of Representatives, January 31, 1842: William J. Cowan, Store-Keeper, Arsenal, North Carolina, 1st of April, 1841.

first Whig President, by his party, during the short period of his ephemeral chief magistracy.

But look further, under his successor. Turn to the same official documents, and see how fiercely and widely the guillotine was again put in motion. He was sworn into office April 6th. The next day was devoted to the public funeral. What opposition and misgivings, or remonstances, came from him during the ensuing five days, urging the delay or abandonment of this policy on the cabinet he inherited, and with what compunctions visitings of conscience he at last proceeded to pay off the legacies left by his predecessor as to further removals, they know best who know most of the anxious discussions which engrossed that painful interval. Let Mr. Tyler have the full benefit of them, as we accord most cheerfully to both him and General Harrison a much stronger wish to redeem their pledges than what seem to have actuated those in favor around them. But certain it is, that on the 12th of April, ere the ashes of Harrison were fully cold, the hounds of proscription were again let loose, and, under the very man who had previously deprecated this whole power of removal, as dangerous to public liberty, and especially fatal to the sacred trial by jury, when used as to marshals, no less than seven of that last class of officers, and four district attorneys, were driven from office in two days, besides several others of the higher grades, with, it is presumed, the usual proportion of fifty to sixty subordinates. In short, during less than five months, amidst numerous other removals, nineteen marshals, and thirteen district attorneys, were remorselessly beheaded, and thus, on the previous reasoning of President Tyler, bold thrusts made at the purity of the administration of justice.

Without further details, it may suffice to add, that this sanguinary system of proscription was persisted in to the very moment of the quarrel of the President with his cabinet and the other Whig leaders; and the entire removals down to two or three weeks previous to September, of those possessing so high a character as to come before the Senate for confirmation, were not less than 180. [See the documents before cited for most of the particular cases.]

Those not coming before the Senate, could not be less than 2,800 more; because, in the Post Office Department alone, it was afterwards admitted on the floor of Congress by Mr. Granger, that while presiding over it, he had made 1,700 removals. This is not one-seventh of all his deputies, intolerant as it seems; and had he remained two weeks longer and removed, as he avowed was his intention, 3,000 more, it would not have been one-third of the whole, while we have it admitted on official record under Mr. Webster's own signature, that before September he had removed near half the whole number of marshals.

Mr. Granger's remarks on this subject possess so much naivete and frankness, we annex the whole of them in a note from the Congressional Globe of June 30th, 1842.*

Mr. Buchanan, on the 24th of June, 1841, (see the Congressional Globe of that date) computed the removals of postmasters to be then going on at the rate of 130 per week; which, if continued six months, would amount to 3,250. In-

* (Page 701.) Mr. Weller observed: "The gentleman (Mr. Granger) said the Democratic party contended for the spoils. Will he tell us how many victims were guillotined whilst he remained in the Post Office Department? Were there no spoils then for which the gentleman himself contended?"

Mr. Granger said, "he would answer the question which had been put to him. The number was 1,700."

Mr. Weller. "Yes! 1,700 individuals turned out of office during the short career of the gentleman; and had he remained in office two weeks longer——"

Mr. Granger "would also give the gentleman information on this head. Had he remained two weeks more, 3,000 would have been added to the list, making 4,700 in all."

Mr. Weller. "These 1,700 men were victimized to this lust after the spoils, before the gentleman himself became a victim. (laughter.) This too, is the gentleman who talks about spoils!"

dependent of these smaller deputies, the subordinate officers in the customs, the light-house keepers, the clerks in the land offices and departments—none of them going to the Senate, undoubtedly exhibited ten or eleven hundred more victims. [See five Indian agents, and six arsenal officers, removed before September, 1841, and not sent to Senate, in doc. No. 58, before cited.] All these would constitute an aggregate of at least 3,000 removals in less than six months, under auspices entirely Whig in their character, and previous to the rupture between that party and their acting President. Nor let any pretend that one in a hundred of these was touched for any cause except a mere honest difference of opinion.

We have exhibited the residence and names of 50 to 60 of the higher officers first falling martyrs to this Draco system, in order that the public may know who and what they were; and we challenge a scrutiny of any charges against the great mass of them. No; the faith of all previous promises seems to have been violated merely, in some cases, to provide lavishly for personal relatives; in others, to reward sycophantic friends—in some, to stop the mouths of hungry partisans, flocking here by thousands for the spoils of victory; in others, to gratify members of Congress, whose immaculate purity during the canvass had denounced the venal tendency of such appointments, but who afterwards wished opportunities, like Messrs. Webster, Bell, and Granger, to figure as confidential advisers in the palace, or, like several others, flatter royalty in foreign courts, or fatten on the loaves and fishes of the customs. Or it has been done because a friend recommended this or that Democratic postmaster to be made "*a head* shorter," merely to help a satellite, or because a sagacious Senator from the remotest East urged his share in the spoils of offices for his Whig partisans so fiercely before he left the Capitol as to get, as early as the 18th and 19th of March, and carry home in his pocket, a vindictive list of removals and new appointments for most of the important stations in his State. Besides several instances in Hon. Mr. McRoberts' speech, before mentioned, where leading Whig journals had admitted that such men in the West as Colonel Milburn and Governor Dodge were removed without any justifiable cause, Mr. Clay himself, at the extra session, made a mockery of the whole pretence, that there was any reason in morals or public misbehavior for most of the removals which had then taken place.

Mr. Buchanan said to him: "Had he (Mr. C.) not over and over again denounced the late Administration on the ground of proscription," for making removals from office? It is stated in the Congressional Globe, June 24, 1841, page 102, that "Mr. Clay, (from his seat, in a jocular way,) said, '*I did, sir, but our position now grows out of the necessity of the case. We cannot, indeed, sir, consent to allow your friends to remain in our confidence.*'"

This is masks off after the election. This is barefaced.

Quite as much were the masks off afterwards, in July, 1842, when General Harrison's Postmaster-General gloried in the fact that, if left in power two weeks longer, he would have removed three thousand more deputies; and without any pretence that it was either for previous moral or official misconduct; else the removals ought to have been made before he left.

When we examine with a little care the names of the proscribed, so far as detailed in this article, and of others in the official documents before cited, it is ridiculous to make any pretence, that most of them were expelled from office for any cause at all like those? Indeed, so manifest was this, that many have been since restored to their former places, and others elevated by the people still higher. What! Dare any one say that James N. Barker, removed from the station of First Comptroller, but since restored, and retained in another situation in the same department, was removed for immorality and incapacity? Or that Stephen Allen, of New York, the faithful Spartan officer, was removed from the situation of Receiver-General, for peculation? Or as to John P. Hale, now a member of Congress from New Hampshire, was he removed for unfit-

ness from the office of district attorney, and to make way for an abolitionist? Or as to James H. Whitcomb, now Governor of Indiana, was he removed, as Commissioner of the General Land Office, because incompetent or unfaithful to duty? Or Jesse D. Bright, Lieutenant-Governor of the same State, was he removed as marshal for any such cause? Or Daniel Kellogg, of Vermont, since candidate for Governor, was he removed from the office of district attorney for reasons like those? Or John H. Wheeler, now Treasurer of the State of North Carolina? Or was Mr. Woodside (we ask the then Secretary of State particularly) removed from Copenhagen for causes like those? Was Robert Lucas, once Governor of Ohio, removed for such reasons? Or General Dodge, now Delegate in Congress from Wisconsin, and the noted James D. Doty appointed his successor, because more patriotic and pure?

Palpably no. On the contrary, the great mass of removals under Whig auspices have been the most barefaced violations of every promise and hope before held out to the people; and as such they ought to brand forever with distrust the unscrupulous abetters of them.

No virtuous community can justify such sudden and profligate breaches of assurances held out—of constitutional opinions, and publickly avowed convictions of duty; and if the guilty have not already felt the reaction in the public mind, sudden and appalling enough for warning, the chief leaders concerned in this new mode of proscribing proscription, will, ere long, learn that they cannot be confided in again to administer the affairs of a truth-loving, and justice-abiding People.

NOTE.—Much has been exaggerated as to the removals made by General Jackson and Mr. Van Buren. It appears from the documents just cited, and which were compiled by our opponents, that in the whole twelve years of their administrations, for cause and without cause, the number was less in some classes, and very little more in others, than in only five months of Whig rule. It must be obvious besides, that in twelve years, many more good and urgent causes for removal would arise than in a few months only.

Extracted from those documents before referred to, the removals of some of the higher classes of officers.

	During twelve years before 4th of March, 1841.	*During only five months after 4th of March*, 1841.
Bureau Officers in Departments	7	6
Surveyors-General of Public Lands	2	5
Officers of Mints	1	3
Governors of Territory	1	3
Secretaries of Territory	2	2
District Attorneys	16	13
Marshals	20	19
Collectors	45	35
Surveyors of Customs	12	20
Naval Officers	7	6
Postmasters, after 1836, $1,000 salary	15	33

See more cases in the documents.

If the removal of these classes should go on for twelve years after the 4th of March, 1841, at the rate they did the first five months after, the people can readily compute how the comparison would stand.

PUBLISHED BY ORDER OF A COMMITTEE OF THE DEMOCRATIC MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.

[50 *Cents per Hundred.*]